No. 638

Office - Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JAN 25 1956
HAROLD B. WILLEY, Clerk

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

AVCO MANUFACTURING CORPORATION and
THE HARRY ALTER COMPANY, INC.,

Petitioners,

—v.—

HAZELTINE RESEARCH, INC.,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT AND APPENDIX

FLOYD H. CREWS
405 Lexington Avenue
New York 17, N. Y.
Attorney for Petitioners

ALDEN D. REDFIELD
CHARLES M. HOGAN
1329 Arlington Street
Cincinnati 25, Ohio

DARBY & DARBY
MORRIS RELSON
405 Lexington Avenue
New York 17, N. Y.

Counsel for Petitioners

LAWYERS PRESS, INC., 214 William St., N. Y. C. 38; Phone: BEekman 3-2300

INDEX

PAGE

Opinions Below 1

Jurisdiction 2

Reasons Relied on for Granting Writ 2

Questions Presented 3

Statutes 4

Statement of the Case 4

The Pleadings, Patent in Suit, and Accused Structure 4

The Decisions Below 5

The Importance of the Patent 5

The Parties 6

The Toulon Invention 6

Avco Does Not Use a Sync Transforming Means 7

Toulon in the Original Patent Intentionally Accepted Claims All of Which Included a Limitation to Sync Transforming Means 7

The Patent Was Reissued to Claim for Toulon a Combination Later Devised by Another, Which Did Not Use a Sync Transforming Means 8

The Reissue Patent Broadened the Claims in Issue by Omitting the Sync Transforming Means 11

The Original Patent Does Not State That the Sync Transforming Means May Be Omitted 12

Avco Now Has a Contingent License 13

PAGE

ARGUMENT—

Evils Attending Reissue Patents Have Again Assumed Large Proportions 13

POINT 1—

There is a direct conflict between Circuits on an important point of law which has not been, but should be, decided by this Court 18

POINT 2—

There is little likelihood of further litigation on the patent 20

POINT 3—

The questions presented are of public importance 21

It Is of Public Importance That an Entire Industry Should Not Pay Patent Royalties Unless Justified 21

The Reissue of Patents to Cover Subsequent Developments Is a Matter of Paramount Public Importance 22

It Is of Public Importance That the Statutory Requirements for Reissue Patents Be Observed to Keep Them Within Their Proper Scope 23

The Court Below Disregarded the Public Interest and Opened the Flood Gates 24

POINT 4—

There is a direct conflict with decisions of this Court 25

PAGE

A Reissue Patent Is Invalid Which Was Filed to Cover the Later Development of Another—Conflict in Principle with Leggett v. Avery, 101 U. S. 256 (1880) and Manufacturing Co. v. Ladd, 102 U. S. 408 (1880) 25

A Reissue Patent Is Invalid Which Omits One Element Prescribed in the Original—Conflict With U. S. Industrial Chemicals, Inc. v. Carbide and Carbon Chemicals Corp., 315 U. S. 668 (1942) 26

Reissue Claims Are Invalid Which Omit a Limitation Intentionally Accepted in the Original Patent Claims—Conflict With Dobson v. Lees, 137 U. S. 258 (1890) 27

A Reissue Patent Is Invalid Which Merely Corrects an Error of Judgment Made in Prosecuting the Original—Conflict with Dobson v. Lees, 137 U. S. 258 (1890) 28

CONCLUSION 29

INDEX TO APPENDIX

PAGE

Opinion of Court of Appeals 1a

Judgment 24a

Order Denying Petition for Rehearing 25a

R. S. Sec. 4916; 45 Stat. 732; 35 U. S. C. 1934 Ed. 64 (Reissue Statute in Effect in 1937) 26a

66 Stat. 808; 35 U. S. C. 1952 Ed. 251 (New Reissue Statute) 27a

Patent Act of 1952 (Public Law 593, 82d Congress, 2d Session, Chap. 950; 66 Stat. 792, approved July 19, 1952)

Sec. 4(a); 66 Stat. 815 (Time of Taking Effect) .. 28a

Sec. 5; 66 Stat. 815 (Repeal of Prior Statutes) 28a

Table of Cases

PAGE

Diebold, Inc. v. Record Files, Inc., 114 F. Supp. 375, 376 (N. D. Ohio, 1953) 19
Dobson v. Lees, 137 U. S. 258, 265 (1890) 27, 28

Exhibit Supply Co. v. Ace Products Corp., 315 U. S. 126, 128 (1942) 21

General Motors Corp. v. Estate Stove Co., 203 F. (2) 912, 917 (C. A. 6, 1953) 18
General Radio Co. v. Allen B. Du Mont Laboratories, Inc., 129 F. (2) 608, 611 (C. C. A. 3, 1942) 29

Hartley Pen Co. v. Lindy Pen Co., 16 F. R. D. 141, 145 (S. D. Cal., 1954) 19
Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co., 322 U. S. 238, 246, 250 (1944) 16, 22, 24, 25

Leggett v. Avery, 101 U. S. 256, 259 (1880) 13, 22, 25
Lyon v. Bausch & Lomb Optical Co., 224 F. (2) 530, 536 (C. A. 2, 1955) 18

Manufacturing Co. v. Ladd, 102 U. S. 408, 411 (1880) 14, 23, 25
Mas v. Coca Cola Co., 163 F. (2) 505, 507 (C. A. 4, 1947) 25
Mas v. Coca Cola Co., 198 F. (2) 380 (C. A. 4, 1952) .. 25
Miller v. Bridgeport Brass Co., 104 U. S. 350, 351-2, 354-5 (1882) 13, 14, 16
Monolith Portland Mid. Co. v. Reconstruction F. Corp., 128 F. Supp. 824, 855 (S. D. Cal., 1955) 25
Muncie Gear Works v. Outboard Marine & Mfg. Co., 315 U. S. 759, 765-6 (1942) 21

PAGE

Pacific Contact Laboratories v. Solex Laboratories, 209 F. (2) 529, 533 (C. A. 9, 1953) 19
Pope Manufacturing Co. v. Gormully, 144 U. S. 224, 234 (1892) 22
Precision Instrument Mfg. Co. v. Automotive Maintenance Machinery Co., 324 U. S. 806, 815, 818 (1945) 16, 23

Randolph Laboratories, Inc. v. Specialties Development Corp., 199 F. (2) 680, 682 (C. A. 3, 1952), certiorari denied 345 U. S. 910 25
Riley v. Broadway-Hale Stores, Inc., 217 F. (2) 530, 531 (C. A. 9, 1954), aff'g 114 F. Supp. 884, 887-9 (D. C., S. D. Cal., 1953) 19

Schriber-Schroth Co. v. Cleveland Trust Co., 305 U. S. 47, 50 (1938) 21
Sontag Chain Stores v. National Nut Co., 310 U. S. 281, 289, 293 (1940) 16

Texas-Miller Hat Corp. v. Switzer Bros., Inc., 201 F. (2) 824, 825 (C. A. 5, 1953) 18

U. S. Industrial Chemicals, Inc. v. Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Corp., 315 U. S. 668, 676-9 (1942) 16, 26

Wooldridge Manufacturing Co. v. R. G. Le Tourneau, Inc., et al., 79 F. Supp. 908 (N. D. Cal., 1948) 25

Statutes and Rules

	PAGE
45 Stat. 732, 35 U. S. C. 1934 Ed. 64, R. S. 4916	3, 4
62 Stat. 928, 28 U. S. C. 1952 Ed. 1254 (1)	2
62 Stat. 929, 28 U. S. C. 1952 Ed. 1292 (4)	2
62 Stat. 931, 28 U. S. C. 1946 Ed., Supp. II, Vol. 1, 1338	2
63 Stat. 104, 28 U. S. C. 1952 Ed. 2101(c)	2
66 Stat. 808, 35 U. S. C. 1952 Ed. 251	3, 4
66 Stat. 815 (Patent Act of 1952, Sec. 4a)	4, 28a
66 Stat. 815 (Patent Act of 1952, Sec. 5)	4, 28a
Supreme Court Rule 22(3)	2